SURVEY

IN THE BALANCE

By Emily Greene Balch

THE FIGHTING ISSUES

By Paul U. Kellogg

"THE STONES WILL CRY OUT"

By John Howard Melish

THE CASE FOR WAR FOR DEMOCRACY

A Cabled Message by David Lloyd George

COTTON PICKERS IN NORTHERN CITIES

By Helen B. Pendleton

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF SOUTH END HOUSE

By George Hodges

Price 10 Cents

February 17, 1917

We say that we are followers of Christ and each of us is pledged to follow His example and try to become like Him. Are we willing to trust the moral and spiritual force of the work, to take our stand there and having done all to stand? Many of us, I fear, accept Christ's principles with many reservations. We are willing to guide our course by His star until this or that contingency shall arise, and then we trust to the brute forces of the world. We are willing to follow Him until certain circumstances arise where His principles no longer seem practicable, and then we resort to other principles. We even persuade ourselves that we are the instruments of divine justice, and are needed by God to put the brute powers in their place, and we take the sword in Christ's name in order to bring to triumph His peace. And this in face of His refusal to resort to the sword and His superb and glorious decision to trust to the forces that make for the triumph of God's truth, righteousness and love. Jesus was no moral coward, nor did He advise weak and shrinking submission to wrongdoing. His courage was sublime. And He lost his life by withstanding church and state. But He repudiated violence and He made use of the forces of truth, righteousness and love whereby to overcome the brute. Shall we do less in His name?

II.

It is the feeling of some that at the juncture of affairs when the brute powers seem about to triumph God should step in and thwart the adversaries of His righteousness and love and truth. Why did God let this war take place in Europe, pious souls have asked. Why did God permit the church and state to triumph even temporarily over His Beloved Son, men have asked for ages. And in their personal misfortunes and sufferings the same searching question has been frequently put.

It is a child's conception of the universe. When we were children our thought of God was on a level with our thought of man. As children the best man we thought was he who gave us exactly what we wanted and when we wanted it. So we thought of God as one who was all powerful, and therefore at an instant could and would give us what we wanted. But when we grew older, when we became parents ourselves, we put away childish things—save sometimes in religion. We know now that the strong, true man is not the man whose action is determined by every request we may make to him, but rather whose action is decided by high principles of honor and justice and wisdom. These virtues do not exclude love—they are the foundation of love—without them the action would not be loving. Therefore our thought of God, if it be a grown, mature thought, must rise from this truer thought of man, and we must think of Him as guided by the most perfect justice and wisdom, in order that He may be perfect love. When you as a father or mother want to give to children the highest joy, the most lasting value, do you not think of laws of health, laws of unselfishness, laws of fairness, and obey these laws absolutely?

"God treats us as sons." His knowledge of the real worth of life is far deeper and truer than ours, as much greater than ours as ours is greater than our children's "and of very faithfulness He may cause us to be troubled." The real joys of life are not to be judged by the joy a baby gets out of a rattle. To have had a chance to cultivate faith and patience, and purity and love and truthfulness, and humility and courage and steadfastness and obedience, is proof enough of the love of God who gives the chance to us, and who shows us ways in which these really great things can be won, not by overriding law, but by obeying law, not by thinking of Him as a law breaker, but rather by thinking of Him as one who is unfailingly and eternally all that our consciences tell us we ought to be.

There are times when Christ's thought and life and principle enter generations as Jesus entered Jerusalem, surrounded only by children and women and a few men. They seem weak and impotent and destined to perish. The blare of trumpets, the neighing of chargers, the strength of arms belong to those who are opposed to Him. There are times when in the conflict between these opposing ideas victory is to the strong and the swift and the ruthless. But appearances are only appearances and the verdict of God reverses the verdict of men. Let us then in the supreme confidence of the ultimate triumph of God's love and truth and righteousness, still say, if these keep silent the stones shall cry out.

The Case for War for Democracy

By David Lloyd George

A LINCOLN DAY MESSAGE CABLED TO THE NEW YORK "TIMES"

I AM very glad to respond to your request for a message for publication on Lincoln Day. I am glad because to my mind Abraham Lincoln has always been one of the very first of the world's statesmen, because I believe that the battle which we have been fighting is at bottom the same battle which your countrymen fought under Lincoln's leadership more than fifty years ago, and most of all, perhaps, because I desire to say how much I welcome the proof which the last few days have afforded that the American people are coming to realize this, too.

Lincoln's life was devoted to the cause of human freedom. From the day when he first recognized what slavery meant he bent all his energies to its eradication from American soil. Yet after years of patient effort he was driven to realize that it was not a mere question of abolishing slavery in the southern states, but that bound up with it was a larger issue: That unless the Union abolished slavery, slavery would break up the Union.

Faced by this alternative, he did not shrink, after every other method had failed, from vindicating both union and freedom by the terrible instrument of war. Nor after the die for war had been cast did he hesitate to call upon his countrymen to make sacrifice upon sacrifice, to submit to limitation upon limitation of their personal freedom, until, in his own words, there was a new birth of freedom in your land.

Is there not a strange similarity between this battle, which we are fighting here in Europe, and that which Lincoln fought? Has there not grown up in this continent a new form of slavery, a militarist slavery, which has not only been crushing out the freedom of the people under its control, but

which in recent years has also been moving toward crushing out freedom and fraternity in all Europe as well?

Is it not true that it is to the militarist system of government which centers in Berlin that every open-minded man who is familiar with past history would point as being the ultimate source of all the expansion of armaments, of all the international unrest, and of the failure of all movements toward cooperation and harmony among nations during the last twenty years?

We were reluctant, and many of us refused to believe that any sane rulers would deliberately drench Europe in its own blood, so we did not face the facts until it was almost too late. It was not until August, 1914, that it became clear to us, as it became clear to Lincoln in 1861, that the issue was not to be settled by pacific means, and that either the machine which controlled the destinies of Germany would destroy the liberty of Europe or the people of Europe must defeat its purpose and its prestige by the supreme sacrifice of war. It was the ultimatum to Serbia and the ruthless attack upon Belgium and France which followed because the nations of Europe would not tolerate the obliteration of the independence of a free people without conference and by the sword, which revealed to us all the implacable nature of the struggle which lay before us.

It has been difficult for a nation separated from Europe by 3,000 miles of sea and without political connections with its peoples, to appreciate fully what was at stake in the war. In your civil war many of our ancestors were blind. Lord Russell hinted at an early peace. Even Gladstone declared "we have no faith in the propagation of free institutions at the point of the sword." It was left for John Bright, that man of all others who most loved peace and hated war, to testify that when our statesmen "were hostile or coldly neutral the British people clung to freedom with an unfaltering trust." But I think that America now sees that it is human unity and freedom which are again being fought for in this war.

The American people under Lincoln fought not a war of conquest, but a war of liberation. We today are fighting not a war of conquest, but a war of liberation—a liberation not of ourselves alone, but of all the world, from that body of barbarous doctrine and inhuman practice, which has estranged nations, has held back the unity and progress of the world, and which has stood revealed in all its deadly iniquity in the course of this war.

In such wars for liberty there can be no compromise. They are either won or lost. In your case it was freedom and unity or slavery and separation, in our case military power, tyrannously used, will have succeeded in tearing up treaties and trampling on the rights of others, or liberty and public right will have prevailed. Therefore, we believe that the war must be fought out to a finish, for on such an issue there can be no such thing as a drawn war.

In holding this conviction, we have been inspired and strengthened beyond measure by the example and the words of your great President. Once the conflict had been joined, he did not shrink from bloodshed. I have often been struck at the growth of both tenderness and stern determination in the face of Lincoln, as shown in his photographs, as the war went on.

Despite his abhorrence of all that war entailed, he persisted in it because he knew that he was sparing life by losing it, that if he agreed to compromise, the blood that had been shed on a hundred fields would have been shed in vain, that the task of creating a united nation of free men would only have to be undertaken at even greater cost at some later day. It would, indeed, be impossible to state our faith more clearly than Lincoln stated it himself at the end of 1864.

"On careful consideration," he said, "of all the evidence it seems to me that no attempt at negotiation with the insurgent leader could result in any good. He would accept nothing short of severance of the Union, precisely what we will not and cannot give. His declarations to this effect are explicit and oft repeated. He does not deceive us. He affords us no excuse to deceive ourselves; . . . between him and us the issue is distinct, simple and inflexible. It is an issue which can only be tried by war and decided by victory."

That was the judgment of the greatest statesman of the nineteenth century during the last great war for human liberty. It is the judgment of this nation and of its fellow-nations overseas today.

"Our armies," said Lincoln, "are ministers of good, not evil." So we do believe. And through all the carnage and suffering and conflicting motives of the civil war, Lincoln held steadfastly to the belief that it was the freedom of the people to govern themselves which was the fundamental issue at stake. So do we today. For when the people of central Europe accept the peace which is offered them by the Allies, not only will the allied peoples be free, as they have never been free before, but the German people, too, will find that in losing their dream of an empire over others, they have found self-government for themselves.

In the Balance

By Emily Greene Balch

AUTHOR OF OUR SLAVIC FELLOW CITIZENS

IT IS EASIER to get into a war than to get out again. Events have a coercive logic of their own. War, too, makes strange bedfellows. As in a strike, combatants find themselves fighting for issues for which they would not have entered the struggle. They find themselves allied with forces they do not desire to strengthen.

What would our lot be in case of success in an anti-German adventure and where might we find ourselves landed?

Doubtless most responsible Americans, as well as the mass of the plain people, do not want to join the Allies as full partners. They conceive of our taking part in such a way as to advance the cause of democracy without underwriting all their war aims.

It is possible that we might go to war debonairly, fight a few naval engagements and be in for a speedy settlement. Even so we forfeit our chance to speak for the "silent mass of mankind," as a joint trustee for civilization and the future, and not as a belligerent partisan.

Moreover, we run the risk of our own jingo crowd following the old war morality, and urging that having spent blood